

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-14 were previously pending in the subject application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-14. Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, and 13-14 and added new claims 51-57. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found, for example, at page 26, line 4 to page 30, line 2 of the subject application. No new matter has been added. Applicant has also canceled claim 12, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, and 51-57 are now pending in the subject application.

Double Patenting

Claim 1 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of SALAS (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,408). Claims 2-4; 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-4, 5-6, and 7-12 of SALAS. Applicant respectfully traverses the double patenting rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 define subject matter that is patentably distinct from the claimed subject matter of SALAS. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the double patenting rejection. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application if the double patenting rejection is maintained, Applicant will submit a Terminal Disclaimer over SALAS upon an indication of allowance in the subject application.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of five references cited by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections with respect to claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the application, Applicant has amended claim 1 to more fully distinguish over the cited references. In addition, various amendments to its associated dependent claims have been submitted for clarification or consistency.

Claim 1 includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the cited references, taken either individually or in combination. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites “receiving a license string that controls access to the product, the license string being generated using a cryptographic process by encoding information corresponding to at least one of: a date of creation of the product; a version of the product; a date of a request for the product; and a date of generation of the license string” and “verifying the license string by: decoding the license string to identify the information; and determining that the information is within a valid range.” The cited references fail to show or suggest the claimed operation of “verifying the license string by: decoding the license string to identify the information; and determining that the information is within a valid range.” And, the cited references fail to show or suggest such operation wherein the information corresponds to at least one of: “a date of creation of the product; a version of the product; a date of a request for the product; and a date of generation of the license string.”

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines subject matter that is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New Claims

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of new claims 51-57, which are also allowable over the cited references. In particular, claim 51 includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the cited references, taken either individually or in combination. For example, claim 51 recites “receiving a license string that controls access to the product, the license string being generated by encrypting: a first information item associated with the product; and a second information item associated with a request for the product” and “verifying the license string by: decrypting the license string to identify the first information item and the second information item; determining that the first information item is within a first valid range; and determining that the second information item is within a second valid range.” The cited references fail to show or suggest the claimed operation of “verifying the license string by: decrypting the license string to identify the first information item and the second information item; determining that the first information item is within a first valid range; and determining

that the second information item is within a second valid range." And, the cited references fail to show or suggest such operation wherein the first information item is "associated with the product," and the second information item is "associated with a request for the product."

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 51 defines subject matter that is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, claim 51 and its dependent claims 52-57 are in a condition for allowance.

Summary

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is, therefore, earnestly requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (650) 843-5852.

Dated: July 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

By:


Cliff Z. Liu
Reg. No. 50,834